

The Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention and Treatment Act of 2000 will fill the critical void left by the 1990 law. This bill will provide Medicaid coverage to uninsured women who have been screened and diagnosed with breast cancer through the Center for Disease Control Program.

As Mother's Day approaches, passage of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention and Treatment Act of 2000 is a fitting tribute to all our mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters.

As a cosponsor of this legislation and a long-time supporter of breast cancer research, I am so delighted to lend my support to this important bill. I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on the issue of Social Security, on the issue of total public debt, it has been suggested by Vice President Gore that we start using the surplus coming in from Social Security and borrowing that money to pay down what is called the debt held by the public.

Just for a brief review, we now owe about \$5.7 trillion total debt. That includes what I call the Wall Street debt, the debt held by the public, at about \$3.7 trillion dollars. It includes what we owe Social Security at approximately \$1 trillion and what we owe the other trust fund at approximately \$1.1 trillion.

The suggestion is that if we use the surplus coming in from Social Security and pay down the Wall Street debt, the debt held by the public, then the savings in interest, which represents about 15 percent of our budget now, pretty bad, we should pay down that debt, using all of that savings to apply to the Social Security Trust Fund so it becomes another giant IOU of a future promise that somehow the Federal Government will come up with the money, but it is sort of like taking one credit card and paying off another credit card because we still owe the money to Social Security.

The suggestion by the Clinton-Gore administration and by Republicans and Democrats is that if we use all these funds by the year 2013 or 2014, we will have paid down that portion of the debt held by the public, the \$3.6 trillion. That sounds good.

But what happens if we do nothing to take care of the long-term problem of Social Security? That debt starts to go back up again. So the paying off is just a blip. Because when the baby-boomers retire, they go out of the paying-in mode and go into the taking-out mode to take Social Security benefits. We change from a dramatic situation of no longer will Social Security taxes be enough to pay existing benefits. So we have a cash flow problem.

Currently, in this country, our total debt represents 35 percent of gross domestic product. By 2013, if we use all of the money to pay it back, then it gets to zero on the debt that we owe the public. But eventually that goes back up to 65 percent if we borrow the money to pay the benefits that we have promised Social Security.

Let me review this chart, sort of a Federal Government spending. The pie chart represents where the Federal budget is being spent this year. Starting at the bottom at 6 o'clock, Social Security is 20 percent. Going clockwise, another entitlement, Medicare, is 11 percent. Medicare eventually, in the next 25 years, will over take Social Security as a cost.

□ 1730

We have Medicaid, the health care program for low-income. The other entitlements represent 14 percent. Domestic discretionary spending represents 19 percent. Defense represents 17 percent; interest, 13 percent of the total budget. Social Security is the biggest program. It is the biggest program in this country. It is the biggest program of any country in the world. And it has been quite successful, so it deserves our attention this presidential election year. So let the debate begin. Let us start talking about it. Let us increase our understanding of the predicament, of the problem, of the estimate by the Social Security Administration actuaries that Social Security is going broke.

Here is why. We have a current surplus coming in from the Social Security tax. The actuaries estimate that somewhere between 2011 and 2014, the cash flow problem will hit us and we go into the red. The red represents that we are going to have to come up with that money. Through cutting other government programs? I doubt it. Increasing taxes? It is going to be hard for politicians to do that. Increased borrowing? Probably the majority of this body, Republicans and Democrats, will say, "Well, let's borrow the money because you can't see that as evidently what we are running as far as a debt that we are leaving to our kids and grandkids."

I am a farmer. I am from a farm. What we grew up doing is saying, we are going to try to pay down the mortgage so that there is a lesser obligation for our kids and grandkids. What we are doing in the Federal Government by not dealing with this problem of Social Security and Medicare entitlements is we are increasing the burden, increasing the mortgage for them to pay in their future years. It is not fair. Let us discuss and debate it this election year.

#### TRADE WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

PASCARELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, in the next hour, many of us in the Congress will lay out what our position is on the China trade vote, which is to come up in a very short period of time.

The time has arrived for a vote on what is now commonly referred to as permanent normal trade relations, or PNTR, for China. We used to call this MFN, or most-favored-nation status. I suppose the proponents thought PNTR sounded kinder and gentler. But bad policy is bad policy, no matter what we call it. So here we are again. This year, the vote is a little different. If annual NTR was not bad enough, this year we are going to vote for permanent NTR status for China. Our argument is not and should not be with the Chinese people. This vote is not a referendum on the 1 billion people who are forced to live under Communist tyranny. This argument is about America's relationship with the Chinese government.

What has the Chinese government done to deserve PNTR? They have not improved the living conditions of their people as China is one of the worst offenders of human rights in the world. China is a country that does not tolerate political dissent or free speech. In the New York Times this past Monday, we see story upon story. This government uses executions and torture to maintain order, to persecute religious minorities, and to violate workers' rights. The State Department report on human rights practices in China is filled with atrocities. Our trade with China has increased, and yet human rights practices are getting worse.

Some feel that American jobs will be lost if PNTR is not passed. The growth in exports would generate 325,000 new jobs. This will not match the over 1 million jobs lost in the United States due to rising imports from the low wages in China. This is a net loss of an additional 817,000 jobs, on top of the 880,000 jobs already lost due to our current trade deficit with China. How can we do something so great in raising the minimum wage for our workers, for our families, and in the next breath give first-class treatment to a nation that features slave labor prison camps as part of its manufacturing community?

And have they made strides to make our trading privileges reciprocal? Has our trade deficit decreased? No, it is now \$68.7 billion and climbing, an increase of 14.6 percent, a 6 to 1 ratio of imports to exports, the most unbalanced relationship we have had in trade in United States history. But I do not see the infrastructure in China to accept any substantial amount of American merchandise. Who, making 13 cents an hour, can afford to buy an automobile? Why would the Chinese government purchase American software for their computers when they already run pirated versions of our own software?

We have seen the failure of NAFTA to improve the living conditions in